ISSN-L: 2223-9553, ISSN: 2223-9944
Vol. 3, No. 3, November 2012

S. T. COLERIDGE AND GERMAN TRANSCENDENTAL PHILOSOPHY: INFLUENCE OR CONFLUENCE?

Charles Ngiewih TEKE
Department of English and American Studies,
University of Munich,
GERMANY.
tekengiewih@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The article grapples with the complex networking between exponents of German Romantic Idealism and S T Coleridge's metaphysics and transcendental speculations, paying specific attention to Biographia Literaria. It argues that Coleridge was immensely influenced by and distinguished himself from German philosophers like Immanuel Kant, Johann Gottlieb Fichte, Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling, Karl Wilhelm Schlegel, Friedrich Leopold, Freiherr von Hardenburg (Novalis) and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel. These philosphers advanced complex, enigmatic and controversial positions on hermeneutic and phenomenological questions of asethetics and sublime, being, nature and mind and spirit, body and soul, the subjective and objevtive and plenitude. The question of influence and/or confluence situates Coleridge's Romantic and idealist speculations in the context of acknowledging the German idealists and submitting to shared ideologies, but at the same time accentuating his formulated opinions prior to and after he met with or read their works. Biographia Literaria as a seminal treatise on English Romanticism expresses how this networking grounded Coleridge's metaphyics in line with artistic and aesthetic concerns. In other words, Coleridge's conviction that a poet was an ardent expression of the mutual inclusivity between phliosophy and creative writing lends credence to his rigorous critical broodings on continental philosophers. His theorisation of imagination in philosophical and poetic expression owes much to both these influneces and his personal stance.

Keywords: German Transcendental Philosophy, Romantic Idealism, Influence, Confluence, Coleridgean Metaphysics

INTRODUCTION

This essay attempts the complex dialogic interaction between Coleridge's philosophical speculations and German transcendental philosophy. English Romantic Idealism had affinities with German Idealism, but as to how this relationship operated remains an unresolved controversy. In the specific case of Coleridge the question as to whether it was a matter of influence or confluence remains complex. The intention of this essay, it must be specified, is not to take a very delicate and controversial issue lightly, for an essay can neither conveniently handle the matter nor do adequate justice to it. A number of studies have handled this enigmatic subject from diverse and subtle perspectives. [1] What is vitally important is how Coleridge's philosophy encapsulated in *Biographia Literaria* shows points of convergence and divergence with proponents of German transcendental philosophy. The novelty of this essay, however imperceptible, lies in this multifaceted networking. *Biographia Literaria* is a seminal work which can be considered Coleridge's literary/philosophical manifesto and therefore expressive of his interaction with contemporary philosophical thinkers on diverse but related issues to art and aesthetics.

The underlying interconnections of philosophical and spiritual thought among the German Idealists and Coleridge's own position provided clues to construing Coleridge's theory of the imagination, symbol, and reality encapsulated in *Biographia Literaria*. The basic tenets of German transcendental philosophy, however diverse they might appear, wielded an enormous impact on Coleridge as they confirmed his struggle at deriving and articulating a metaphysics that placed the mind and soul as components of priority to his spiritual speculations.

Coleridge's visit to Germany in 1798 was a major breakthrough in the Germanic-English Romantic connection. Looking at these influences strictly chronologically may prove laborious, and contending as to who had the greatest impact on Coleridge, or through whom he had greater access to German Idealism only complicates the debate. [2] The suggestion is that it would be better to see him in the broader context of German Transcendentalism, that is, the inclusive context where nature, science, religion and theology, aesthetics and metaphysics all interplay.

The German philosophers include: Immanuel Kant (1724 – 1804), Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762 – 1814), Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling (1775 – 1854), Karl Wilhelm Schlegel (1772 – 1829), Friedrich Leopold, Freiherr von Hardenburg (Novalis) (1772 – 1801) and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770 – 1831). *Biographia Literaria* is principally concerned with literature and art, whereby Coleridge extensively talks about the poet rather than the philosopher, though he strongly connects the two; philosopher poet.

The Influence and Confluence Axis

Kant's transcendental metaphysics, which Coleridge intensively read in *Critique of Pure Reason* (1781) and *Metaphysical Foundations of Natural Science* (1786), impacted much on his own philosophical and transcendental speculations. Coleridge acknowledged Kantian metaphysics' immense impact on him, comparable to no other:

The writings of the illustrious sage of Koenigsberg, the founder of the Critical Philosophy, more than any other work, at once invigorated and disciplined my understanding. The originality, the depth, and the compression of the thoughts; the novelty and subtlety, yet solidity and importance of the distinctions; the adamantine chain of the logic...the clearness and evidence, of the *Critique of the Pure Reason*; and *Critique of the Judgment*; of the *Metaphysical Elements of Natural Philosophy*; and of his Religion within the bounds of Pure Reason, took possession of me as with the giant's hand.

Kantian transcendentalism saw a possible interaction between mind and nature, but it insisted on the subsequent superiority of the mind over nature. His theory of productive and reproductive imagination, and the sublime, greatly impressed and influenced Coleridge's thought.

Kant argued that when we perceive nature it ignites something which is not subject to the rules of empirical understanding, indicating a consciousness that surpasses sense. Stressing the necessity of a metaphysical intuition and the sublime, since the substance of the thing-in-itself is not graspable by mere human reason; Kant argues that reality is perceived through the forces of repulsion and attraction. He was not very concerned with the questions of spirit and matter; in fact, he dismissed the notion of duality. He held instead that spiritual power is not in the realm of nature, but outside it, though constantly influencing it. The attributes of the sublime given to nature, Kant accentuates, are an exclusive prerogative of the reflective awareness of mind. This point was supported by the English philosopher George Berkeley.[3] Kant sees this attribution as an error of the imagination. This is a point which did not fit well into Coleridge's monistic system and dynamics of self that finds expression in *Biographia Literaria* and his poetry.

Coleridge rejected the notion of the seperability of mind and nature, seeing both as having a strong and mutually rewarding relationship. One thing that remains comprehensible is that, though Kant was to place the mind as superior than all else, there seems to be a justification of a "physico-theological"[4] proof of the existence of God in his system. Though he strongly acknowledged Kant Coleridge aired out his differences with his mentor. In an insightful reaction to the German philosopher he says:

In spite ... of his own declarations, I could never believe, it was possible for him to have meant more by his *Noumenon*, or THING IN ITSELF, than his mere words express; or that in his own conception he confined the whole *Plastic* power to the forms of the intellectual, leaving for the external course, for the *materiale* of our sensations, a matter without form, which is doubtless inconceivable. I entertain doubts likewise, whether in his own mind, he even laid *all* the stress, which he appears to do on moral postulates. (*Coleridge*, 155)

What is implicitly, if not expressly stated here is that, the external cannot be excluded in the process of transcendental or spiritual realisation, it must relate and negotiate, as it were, with the internal, mind,

ISSN-L: 2223-9553, ISSN: 2223-9944
Vol. 3, No. 3, November 2012

soul. Both are supposed to mutually produce transcendental effects. One may equally say here that Coleridge seems to be engaged in or adopting a hermeneutic stance in this critique, given that he seems to show an understanding of Kant's mysticism and transcendentalism more than Kant himself.

Johann G. Fichte was among the first thinkers to have carried forward Kant's philosophy. According to Coleridge's early views on the philosopher, he was to add the key-stone of the arch. Modelling his transcendentalism on Kant Fichte elaborated a system which aimed at establishing the logical interdependence, and ultimately, the psychological identity of self and the world. Fichte came under charges of atheism because of the revolutionary attitude of his concepts, and Coleridge was eventually to fall out with him because his later thought did not fit well into the pattern of his Spinozist/monistic speculations. Coleridge dismissed the philosopher, complaining that he overbuilt his fundamental ideas "with heavy mass of mere notions, and psychological acts of arbitrary reflection" (*Coleridge*, 157). Coleridge's critique of the Fichtean metaphysics is a clear expression that, though he acknowledged influences, he did not assimilate or expound them uncritically. This, one may argue, must not only have been to satisfy the prevailing metaphysical debate of the time, for it becomes increasingly clear that Coleridge must have had his own ingrained ideas. Elaborating his dissatisfaction with Fichte he says:

Thus his theory degenerated into a crude egoismus, a boastful and hyperstoic hostility to NATURE, as lifeless, godless, and altogether unholy: while his *religion* consisted in the assumption of mere ORDO ORDINAS, which we were permitted *exotericé* to call GOD; and his *ethics* in an ascetic, and almost monkish, mortification of the natural passions and desires. (*Coleridge*, 159 – 160)

Schelling was another influential post-Kantian philosopher, whose philosophy found much common ground with Kant. But Schelling's philosophy of nature, of artistic identity, and his *System of Transcendental Idealism* (1800), developed a new philosophical conception of knowledge, art, and a new interpretation of how the self is related to the world of nature. The use of Schellingian philosophy, it should be stressed, is with regard to Schelling's early writings. The reason being that, in his long philosophical career Schelling's later thought and speculations registered variants that do not suit the purpose of the argument handled here. Coleridge embraced Schelling, seeing him as providing the answer and an advanced statement on the incomplete or inadequate system of Kant. Of all the German philosophical investigations, Schellingian philosophy deeply influences Coleridge's thought, most particularly his theory of imagination, polarity-thinking, and symbol.

It may be curious, however, to be reminded that Coleridge in *Biographia* I claims that he found in Schelling a co-incidence of thought, arguing that he had been brooding on the issue for long and found the German philosopher as providing a justification to this (*Coleridge*. 160 – 161). But knowing how complex Coleridge is, this statement should not be taken uncritically, because, without wanting to belabour the charges of dishonesty and plagiarism on him, he translated much of Schelling's thought into his system without much display of the psychology of anti-thesis or the anxiety of influence. This notwithstanding, Coleridge was not Schelling, and there is much to justify the different views they had with regard to their systems, especially with regard to the question of subjectivity and objectivity. Coleridge still pays indebtedness to him, " not only as a great and original genius, but as the founder of the Philosophy of Nature, and as the most successful improver of the Dynamic System"

Following Kant's argument, Schelling holds that the external world is simply an adjunct to the mind which is the most real. But he adds another dimension to this philosophy, seeing art as the way the mind could come to full awareness of itself. The relationship between art and the intuitive imagination, therefore, becomes central in Schelling's aesthetic and spiritual speculations. He argues that the aesthetic activity unites the ideal world of art and the real world of objects. In other words, art is an expression of the unity of the conscious and unconscious activity in the self.

Schelling's scheme proposes a kind of onto-theological monism through which knowledge can be achieved. He formulates the notion of a reciprocal concurrence of the self with nature, the subjective with the objective, the conscious with the unconscious. This formulation justifies the concept of polarity which permeates most of Coleridge's poetry and philosophical engagements. The self also becomes a pivotal concept in Schelling's philosophy on the production of art because; many factors

take place in the shaping of the artist's identity. Transcendental philosophy, as it were, affirms the identity of conscious and unconscious activity of the self. The final goal of the various processes involved in artistic creativity is the harmony of the artist, encapsulated in the union of the self and nature. The most important issue to be understood here in Schelling's deduction of the art production is the development of the artist's new identity in objective reality.

Schelling presents dialectic between man and nature that reconciles and fuses the transcendental intelligence of the artist with the material system of nature. The power of the imagination is the power of Schelling's cosmological realm of the creative production of art, which is the unconscious and unconscious realm of the mind. In fact, to Schelling, the ultimate actuality of artistic production usually results in the reconciliation or synthesis of opposite or contradictory forces by the imaginative faculty. So the system apprehends God and the imagination as dipolarising forces. Credit goes to Schelling for having formulated some of the initial bases on which art was to be seen as expressive and organic rather than what traditional theory held of it as mimetic or imitative. Again, he paved the way for the hermeneutico-phenomenological emphasis on theoretical and practical criticism, which Friedrich Schleiermacher was later to crystallise into a general philosophy of interpretation.

Coleridge, we have underscored, was very preoccupied with the questions of mind and nature, feeling and thought, and the objective and the subjective realms of knowledge. Most of what he disagreed with in Kantianism, found acceptable modification in Schelling. No doubt he profusely uses Schelling, though his own distinctive stance shows that he relied more on the subjective rather than the objective goal of art or poetry as an approximation of self-expression. One can ascertain that in stressing the priority of place to the objective rather than the subjective, Schelling's transcendental philosophy paradoxically seems to be advocating an aesthetic poetics rather than that which gears towards a subjectivised spiritual consciousness. Besides, the Schellingian notion that art is the highest expression and synthesis of self does not fit well with the dynamics of developing self characteristic of Coleridge. Coleridge's writing shows different states of consciousness and resists any uncritical idealist categorisations, that is, his texts show a balance of visionary and idealist enthusiasm, but express his anti-self-consciousness in his permanent struggle for the ideal. Coleridge will therefore be seen to have adopted an advanced aesthetic and transcendental philosophy from Schelling, given that his writing provides a better answer to the quest of what artistic texts are expressive of.

What undoubtedly attracted Coleridge very much, as we will see, is the intuitive faculty of the imagination and the transcendental philosophy of nature which place nature on grounds of organicism, corresponding with the lines on which the faculty of the imagination functions. He was, for instance, to see the universe as a cosmic web, created by God and held together by the cross-strands of attractive and repulsive forces. In his arguments in Chapter Twelve of *Biographia* I, "Requests and Premonitions," he uses Schelling to make statements that lead to his central definition of the imagination in the next chapter. For example on the concept of the reality of intuitive knowledge, "The ultimate ground of all reality specifically is a something ... by which the principle of being and of thinking coincide" (Coleridge, 265). There is also the question of truth as mediate, that is, derived from other truths, and as original, that is, a subjective and intuitive feeling (Coleridge, 264 – 269).

Friedrich Freiherr von Hardenberg, better known by his pseudonym Novalis (1772 – 1801), is associated with the strong mystical strain in German literature and philosophical tradition, and is little known to have had a connection with English Romanticism. But Coleridge knew and read his work, and was not indifferent to his metaphysical and transcendental philosophy.[5] It is acceptable to say that, most of what Novalis postulates seems to find expression in Coleridge's thought and poetry, though this does not necessarily mean that Coleridge wrote with a Novalian consciousness. Novalis adopts a homeopathic tradition to explain his metaphysics of nature and human consciousness, stressing that contact with nature is a pharmaceutical principle, a poison and a healer. He sees illness as a positive prerequisite for wholeness and the soul as the embodiment of the ambivalence of the pharmaceutical principle. He expresses a view which was later to preoccupy much of Coleridge's thought, that illness or affliction in general is vitally important for creativity and artistic production and for the purification or rebirth of the spirit as well. This view also sides with Schlegel's conception of the world as eternally chaotic, fragmentary, and even incomprehensible, but which could have the possibility of order in

ISSN-L: 2223-9553, ISSN: 2223-9944
Vol. 3, No. 3, November 2012

every creative process in art or poetry, and in the general search for the absolute or transcendental reality. No doubt they both dominated the early German Romantic scene with the philosophy of fragmentation and irony,[6] and have greatly contributed to the theorising of the phenomenon of Deconstruction.

David Farell Knell (1998, 69) quotes Novalis's assertion to express what Novalis calls the bisexuality of nature, which finds expression both in life and death: "Illnesses are the learning years of the art of life and the formation of the heart". Illness is, therefore, an integral part of individuation, and nature, even in its ugliness and decomposition, Novalis holds, is a higher home than religion, for without matter there is no spirit. Death, he also postulates, is the only means through which definitive attainment of the Supreme Being can be possible. This again relates to Schlegel's speculative philosophy of becoming as the ultimate essence in existence, and it is also not unconnected with Jacobi's view that the Being of all being is God, or in more general terms transcendent reality, however it is perceived. One can modify Jacobi here by saying that we are partly being engaged in the process of becoming or joining the being of all being.

As concerns art and poetry, Novalis held that life was not something to be known, but a process of creation whereby what is created is always other than the power to create: "Poetry elevates each single thing through a particular combination with the rest of the whole ... Writing poetry is creating. Each work of literature must be a living individual." What is interesting here is the question of the part as constituent of the whole which permeates much of Coleridge's poetry. Most importantly, however, is the contention that writing poetry presupposes creating, and one may add discovering, justifying the self as dynamic.

Friedrich Schlegel and Friedrich Hegel are two important German idealist philosophers whose hermeneutics and phenomenology throw light on the thrust of our discussion with regard to the Romantic concept of irony, fragmentation, and dialectic. These connect with the question of becoming that demonstrates the idealist and constructivist tendency that is decipherable in Coleridge. The basic question to be examined here is Coleridge's relation to the two, and if at all he used their philosophy to establish his own speculative sphere, or whether the affinities inherent in his thought and which correspond to theirs are a matter of coincidence or phenomenological criticism and interpretation.[7]

As one of the most important of the early German Romantic philosophers Friedrich Schlegel needs not to be much emphasised here. His metaphysical investigation included Socrates and Neo-Platonist, and his writings point to revolutionary changes that shaped much of Romantic speculations and modern theories in literary and philosophical criticism as well. His conceptualisation of fragmentation, chaos, and incomprehensibility engendered his poetics of the Romantic irony, which in his perspective negotiates between opposition and contradiction, but whose hermeneutic goal is geared towards the progressive attempt at harmonisation and comprehensibility. Becoming, as the ultimate vision and reality in his poetics, presupposes a continuous and evolving process of the self, or to put it in his own terms a continual self-creating process consisting in the interchange of opposites. His notion of the imagination as destructive, but whose destruction is positive for it is only through this that artistic creativity is fostered, obviously impacted and influenced Coleridge's definition of the secondary imagination as a willed act of perception that dissolves, dissipates, and diffuse in order to recreate and harmonise. He held strongly that existence prospers in chaos and confusion, because the fertility of chaos engendered new creation and continuity.

Schlegel argues that, like nature, the world of philology is infinite and inexhaustible. His aesthetic theory and metaphysical idealism, therefore, echo most of what Coleridge was to develop in his *Biographia*. But what is very intriguing in Schlegelian thinking is what is now termed the Schlegelian paradox, or what he himself coined as Philosophical Irony, stressing a subtle modification, if not subversion of Socratic irony. Encapsulated in the *Fragments* and even in *On the Limits of Beauty*, this philosophy provides a kind of new model in thinking and artistic creativity which has to do both with systematic and anti-systematic consciousness, "It is equally deadly for the mind to have a system and to have none," or again, "One can only become a philosopher, but not be one. As soon as one believes he is a philosopher, he stops being one," or with regard to the incomprehensibility and opaqueness of language, is "the impossibility and necessity of complete communication."

This unsystematic system, according to Schlegel, can be reconstructed. It provides the paradigm of Romantic discourse. The imagination can provide a hermeneutic activity of interpreting and revealing the interconnection that lurk in fragments, paradoxes and ironies. The self, faced with fragmentations or psychological conflicts, must engage in a process of poetic reflection, the outcome of which should be progressive:

The Romantic kind of poetry is still in the state of becoming; that, in fact, is its real essence: that it should forever become and never be perfected. It can be exhausted by no theory and only a divinatory criticism would dare try to characterise its ideal. (Anne Mellor, 16)

So the idea of Schlegel's fragments, as Mellor rightly holds, refers to the absolute synthesis, but this should not be taken as the monistic identity sought for in certain articulations of the dialectic, but precisely the continual self-creating interchange of opposites. Coleridge's philosophy and poetry have affiliations with Schlegel with regard to the metaphysical power of the imagination and the self-conscious attempt at reconciling discordant and conflicting principles.

With regard to Hegelian idealism, Coleridge did not find satisfaction with Hegel's progressive and transcendental dialectics for it could mean an end to his philosophical curiosity, though it is evident that Hegel's theory of the logos must have interested his monistic philosophy of the constant struggle to attain the One. The *Phenomenology of Spirit* (1807), which is one of his works that best describes his philosophical argument, sees the self as engaged in a process which end goal is full realisation. Thus, the theorisation of the dialectics as engendering the tendency whereby a thesis presupposes an antithesis and both fuse or synthesise for completion and absolute knowledge. This concept of the dialectics also finds expression in *Philosophy of History* (1812) and the *Science of Logic* (1812 – 1816). Though Derrida and other Deconstructionists like Tilottama Rajan have strongly challenged Hegelian dialectics, its enduring persistence shows that it cannot be dismissed in Western philosophical discourse.

While the concept of attaining the absolute in Hegelian terms is not very clear as to whether attaining this absolute knowledge or truth presupposes a spiral and continuous or progressive movement of the self to the totality of Being, or final harmonisation with the supreme, it all the same suggests this ideal. This can therefore mean that, the reconciliation of opposites and contradictions is an unending self-journey towards the definitive realisation of being. At this juncture, one can analyse the Coleridgean concept of the metaphysics of the imagination in terms of its struggle towards wholeness, or again as a prefiguration of transcendental and spiritual possibility rather than a complete achievement of wholeness. It is evident that Coleridge's adherence to logocentricism in explicating his philosophical and spiritual speculations indicates his indebtedness to Hegelian transcendentalism.

CONCLUSION: THE ANXIETY OF CREATING A DISTINCTIVE SPACE

The foregoing discussion on German Idealism and Romanticism situates Coleridge's aesthetic and philosophical speculations, and the convictions he held in face of this. The variety of concepts discussed point to central issues on Coleridge's idealist and constructivist engagements. Coleridge faced the immense burden of articulating a distinctive voice, but was always caught by acknowledged influences from which he drew but attempted to depart from. With regard to the imagination, for example, he borrows greatly from his German counterparts, even though he makes questionable claims at times concerning his personal right and even his originality to most of the ideas that he finds in them. However, it goes without doubt that his reconceptualisation and synthesis of these existing views, brought about a resounding and renovating outlook of the Romantic imagination and idealism on a huge strand of English Romanticism, encapsulated in Chapters 13 and 14 of *Biographia Literaria*. No matter what controversy may surround Coleridge's engagement with, indebtedness and obligation to German transcendentalism, it is certain that he had a distinctive way of seeing things and relied on the evidence of his philosophical and aesthetic convictions in whatever direction of discourse he found himself in.

ISSN-L: 2223-9553, ISSN: 2223-9944
Vol. 3, No. 3, November 2012

ENDNOTES

1. Some sources which handle some of the subtleties concerning German idealism in connection with Coleridge's thought: Thomas McFarland, *Coleridge and the Pantheist Tradition* (1969), particularly "Coleridge and Philosophical Originality" (Xxiii – xi), and "The Problem of Coleridge's Plagiarism" (1 – 52), Anne Mellor, *English Romantic Irony* (1980), Frederick Burwick, "Coleridge, Schlegel, and Animal Magnetism," *English and German Romanticism: Cross-Currents and Controversies* (1985), Andrew Bowie, *From Romanticism to Critical Theory: The Philosophy of German Literary Theory* (1997), Erna Oesch, "The Symbolic Absolute: Friedrich Schelling's Idea of Knowledge and its Impact on Romantic Hermeneutics" (1998), Hans Werner Breunig, "Some Considerations Concerning the Influence of German Idealism on S. T. Coleridge" (1998), and David Farell Knell, *Contagion Sexuality, Disease, and Death in German Idealism and Romanticism* (1998).
2. For example in a letter written to Thomas Poole dated 20 November 1798, Coleridge indicates that he was quite aware of Kant before going to Göttingen. He claims to have found himself among outright Kantians, "All are Kantians who I have met with" (*Letters* I, 444). Kant held his attention for some time, but as to whether this was lasting can be determined largely by his critique on Kant or the affinities that literary or philosophical discourse discern between them. Raimonda Modiano holds that Kant, Schelling and Steffens had the greatest impact on Coleridge. Hans Werner Breunig is of the conviction that it is Kant and not Schelling who implanted a strong mark on Coleridge (196). The centrality of Breunig is Kantian and Schellingian idealism. Julie Carlson in *The Theatre of Romanticism* (1994) thinks that Schiller is the key figure or main channel of Coleridge's entry and immersion in German idealism.
3. Coleridge's criticism of Berkeley as having failed to provide an abiding place for his philosophy is recorded in his 1804 notebook entry (*Coleridge's Notebooks* I, 1842), and can be found in Thomas McFarland's *Coleridge and the Pantheist Tradition* (1869), 158 – 159, & 300 – 303.
4. Quoted in Hans Werner Breunig, "The Influence of German Idealism on S. T. Coleridge," (189).
5. See David Farrell Knell's *Contagion, Sexuality, Disease, and Death in German Idealism and Romanticism* (1998), 35 – 70. There is no complete and available copy of his work in English, but his basic ideas share an affinity with most of his German counterparts, especially on the concept of nature and self. He however adds a dimension on psychopathology.
6. Romantic fragmentation, irony, and contradiction, however diverse they might have been in Romantic thinking, were founded on a philosophy that was dominantly idealistic and constructivist rather than empirical and deconstructive. Postmodern criticism, especially Deconstruction resists any visionary or metaphysical construction of the concept or self. It takes the notion to fit into its philosophy of irony, ambivalence, and aporias, and within the context of resistance to theory.
7. For a comprehensive reading of Schlegel and Hegel in connection with English Romanticism see, for example, Anne Mellor, *English Romantic Irony* (1980), particularly "The Paradigm of Romantic Irony," 3 – 30, John Beer, "Fragmentations and Ironies," (1995), Tilottama Rajan, "Phenomenology and Romantic Theory," (1995), *Deconstruction and the Remainders of Phenomenology* (1995), and Peter Zima, *Deconstruction and Critical Theory* (2002), particularly "Kant, Hegel and Derrida: The (Non)Conceptual Beautiful," 2 – 8, and "Friedrich Schlegel's Romanticism: Deconstruction Avant la Lettre," 8 - 12. The last three authors apply the metaphysics of Schlegel and Hegel within the context of their poetics of Deconstruction. Peter Zima, nevertheless, concedes to the Romantic thinking of the Schlegels, stressing that their basic tenets are irreconcilable with the poetics of Deconstruction even if one finds certain affinities between them and Deconstruction (11). Most of the excerpts of Schlegel here are drawn from Mellor's work, where she discusses

works such as *Dialogue on Poetry and Athenaeum Fragments*. In this regard acknowledgement and indebtedness go to her.

REFERENCES

Bowie, A. (1997). *From Romanticism to Critical Theory: The Philosophy of German Literary Theory*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Carlson, J. (1994). *In the Theatre of Romanticism. Coleridge, Nationalism, Women*. Cambridge University Press.

Coleridge, S.T. (1983). *Biographia Literaria or Biographical Sketches of my Literary Life and Opinions*. Vols. I & II. Eds. James Engell and Walter Jackson Bate. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

(1957). *Notebooks: Notes 1794 – 1804*. Vol. I. Ed. Kathleen Coburn. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

(2002). *Selected Letters*. Ed. Grant F. Scott. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Beer, J. "Fragmentations and Ironies." (1995). *Questioning Romanticism*. Ed. John Beer. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press. 234 – 264.

Berkeley, G. (1967). Siris: A Chain of Philosophical Reflections and Inquiries Concerning the Virtues of Tar, Water, and Diverse Other Subjects, *Backgrounds of Romanticism*: *English Philosophical Prose of the Eighteenth Century*. Ed. Loenard M. Trawick. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. 21 – 72.

Breunig, H.W. (1998). Some Considerations Concerning the Influence of German Idealism on S T Coleridge, *British Romantics as Readers: Intertextualities, Maps of Misreading, Reinterpretations*. Eds. Michael Gassenmeier et al. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter. 183 – 199.

Engell, J. (1981). *The Creative Imagination: Enlightenment to Romanticism*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Fichte. (1988). *Early Philosophical Writings* Trans. and ed. Daniel Breazeale. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988. (Contains Selections from Fichte's Writings and Correspondence from the Jena period, 1794–1799).

(1992). *Foundations of Transcendental Philosophy (Wissenschaftslehre) nova methodo* (1798/99). Trans. and ed. Daniel Breazeale. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Forster, M.N. (1998). *Hegel's Idea of a Phenomenology of Spirit***,** Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kant, I. (1911). Part One "The Critique of Aesthetic Judgment," which includes "The Analytic of the Beautiful" and "The Analytic of the Sublime." Translated by James Creed Meredith . Oxford: Oxford University Press.

(2004)*Metaphysical Foundations of Natural Science* (1786). Michael Friedman (Translator). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Knell, D. F. (1998). *Contagion: Sexuality, Disease, and Death in German Idealism and Romanticism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

McFarland, T. (1969). *Coleridge and the Pantheist Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mellor, A.K. (1980). *English Romantic Irony*. London: Methuen.

Modiano, R. (1985) *Coleridge and the Concept of Nature*. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.

*Novalis. (1997). Philosophical Writings***.** Margaret Mahony Stoljar (ed. and trans.), Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

ISSN-L: 2223-9553, ISSN: 2223-9944
Vol. 3, No. 3, November 2012

Oesch, E. (1998). The Symbolic Absolute: Friedrich Schelling's Idea of Knowledge and it s Impact on Romantic Hermeneutics, http://www.uta.fi/laitok.set/mattiet/filosofia/symbolic.htm Accessed on 4th November 2009.

Rajan, T. (1980). *Dark Interpreter: The Discourse of Romanticism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

(1995). Phenomenology and Romantic Theory: Hegel and the Subversion of Aesthetics, *Questioning Romanticism*. Ed. John Beer. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press. 155 – 178.

Ricoeur, P. (1974). *The Conflict of Interpretations: Essays in Hermeneutics*. Trans. & Ed. Don Ihde. Evanston, III.: North Western University Press.

Rosen, M. (1982). *Hegel's Dialectic and Its Criticism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schlegel, K.W.F. (1991). Philosophical Fragments .Peter Firchow (Translator). Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

Schelling. (1978). System of Transcendental Idealism (1800). Published by Charlottesville, University Press of Virginia, 1978, translated by Peter Heath. Introduction and Part I reproduced here. http://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/ge/schellin.htm

Wheller, K. (1980). Sources, Processes and Methods in Coleridge's *Biographia Literaria*. London: Heinemann.

Zima, P.V. (2002). *Deconstruction and Critical Theory*. Trans. Rainer Emig. London: Continuum.